

Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the office action mailed May 4, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

2. Status of the Claims

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite an email server inserting a tag into the email, transmitting said email to a voice command platform, and the voice command platform detecting said tag. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, including for instance at page 15, line 7 – page 18, line 4.

Applicant has amended claim 5 to recite a voice command platform processing said email message to identify an original email message and a reply message to said original email message, the voice command platform rendering said original email message as speech in a first voice mode, and the voice command platform rendering said reply message as speech in a second voice mode, said second voice mode being different from said first voice mode. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, including for instance at page 16, line 4 – page 18, line 4.

Applicant has amended claim 30 to correct a typographical error. Further, Applicant has canceled claims 3-4. Still further, Applicant has added new claims 34-36, of which claim 34 is independent. Claim 34 recites a method that comprises an email client application inserting a tag into an email, wherein said tag separates a first content in said email provided by a first source from a second content in said email provided by a second source. Support for these newly added claims is provided throughout the specification, including for instance at page 15, line 7 – page 18, line 4.

3. Response to Rejections

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-patentable subject matter. Independent claim 1 as now amended recites the steps of an email server inserting a tag into the email, transmitting said email to a voice command platform, and the voice command platform detecting said tag. These steps are clearly machine implementations and thus meet the test for patentable subject matter set forth by the Federal Circuit in the *Bilski* case. Therefore, claim 1 is directed to patentable subject matter, and claims 2 and 25-33 are directed to patentable subject matter due to their dependency from independent claim 1.

Independent claim 5 as now amended recites the steps of a voice command platform processing said email message to identify an original email message and a reply message to said original email message, the voice command platform rendering said original email message as speech in a first voice mode, and the voice command platform rendering said reply message as speech in a second voice mode, said second voice mode being different from said first voice mode. These steps are clearly machine implementations and thus meet the test for patentable subject matter. Therefore, claim 5 is directed to patentable subject matter, and claims 6-10 are directed to patentable subject matter due to their dependency from claim 5.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 101 rejections. Applicant submits that claims 1-2, 5-10 and 25-33 are in condition for allowance.

4. Claims 34-36

Applicant also submits that newly added claims 34-36 are in condition for allowance. Of these claims, claim 34 is independent. Newly added claim 34 is directed to a method of rendering content of an email as speech comprising the steps of: an email client application

inserting a tag into the email, wherein said tag separates a first content in said email provided by a first source from a second content in said email provided by a second source; transmitting said email to a voice command platform for rendering said email as speech wherein said system supports two or more different voice modes; and the voice command platform detecting said tag, wherein, when said email is rendered as speech, said first content is rendered in a first voice mode and said second content is rendered in a second voice mode, with the second voice mode being different from the first voice mode. These steps are clearly machine implementations and thus meet the test for patentable subject matter. Therefore, claim 34 is directed to patentable subject matter, and claims 35-36 are directed to patentable subject matter due to their dependency from claim 34.

5. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-2, 5-10 and 25-36 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3350.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: August 4, 2009

By: Scott M. Miller
Scott M. Miller
Reg. No. 62,967